

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 24, 2009. Claims 12-21 and 23-29 are presented for examination, of which Claims 12, 20 and 21 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, a new and more descriptive title was required. Applicant has amended the title accordingly.

Claims 12-14, 16-18, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0156947 (Nishio) in view of U.S. Patent 6,216,196 (Elwell et al.), and Claims 15, 19, 25 and 29, as being unpatentable over *Nishio* in view of *Elwell* and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,903,716 (Kimber et al.).

Applicant submits that the independent claims, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

As discussed in the specification and the Amendment of August 28, 2009, a device which has a plurality of functions, each requiring a distinct driver, may not support the Universal Plug and Play (UPnP) protocol. For example, the device could be a printer, and each function could correspond to a rendering language supported by the printer (para. [0015] and [0016]). It would be important to enable communication between such a device and other devices which communicate through UPnP to properly utilize the device and its functions.

According to certain aspects of the present invention, a proxy server presents such a device as a plurality of devices which support UPnP, one for each function of the device (Abstract). Specifically, upon determining that such a device does not support UPnP, the proxy server generates a plurality of entries in its database for the device, one for each function of the

device (Fig. 7). In response to a subsequent client search for UPnP-supporting devices, the proxy server returns a plurality of replies on behalf of the device corresponding to the plurality of entries in its database (para. [0090]-[0093]). In this way, the client is allowed to communicate with the device as if it were communicating with a plurality of UPnP-supporting devices.¹

Claim 12 recites, among other features, “generating means for... generating a plurality of device IDs corresponding to a plurality of functions of the network device recognized by said recognition means... and response means for responding to the client apparatus using the plurality of device IDs generated by said generating means.”

These features are not believed to be disclosed or suggested in *Nishio* and *Elwell*, considered separately or in any permissible combination. While conceding that these features are not disclosed in *Nishio*, the Office Action states that they are in *Elwell*. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As Applicant understands, *Elwell* relates to an arbitrator system which manages the communication between multiple device drivers on a host computer and one multifunctional device (*see* Abstract). Apparently, the host computer, which is a client to the multifunctional device, can readily communicate with the multifunctional device and is aware that the multifunctional device has multiple functions, such as printing and fax. That explains why the multiple device drivers on the host computer, which need to work independently for backward compatibility, would all attempt to communicate with the multifunctional device, which in turn motivates the introduction of the arbitrator system (*see* col. 1, lines 34-42). It is therefore certainly not part of the arbitrator system’s job to communicate to the host computer the existence of multiple functions in the multifunctional device and what those functions are.

¹ It is to be understood that the scope of the claims is not limited by the details of this or any other embodiment that may be referred to.

Accordingly, *Elwell* is not believed to disclose or suggest “generating means for... generating a plurality of device IDs corresponding to a plurality of functions of the network device recognized by said recognition means... and response means for responding to the client apparatus using the plurality of device IDs generated by said generating means,” as recited in Claim 12.

The portions of *Elwell* cited in the Office Action as disclosing the quoted features of Claim 12 describe merely that the multiple device drivers on the host computer would attempt to access the multifunctional device independently, conflicts may arise when these device drivers attempt do so at the same time, and the arbitrator system might help resolve the conflicts (*see* col. 1, lines 26-50, and col. 3, line 60, - col. 4, line 16). They do not teach that any system, including the arbitrator system, would need to and actually generate “a plurality of device IDs corresponding to a plurality of functions” possessed by the multifunctional device and communicate the plurality of device IDs to the host computer.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Claim 12 is believed patentable over *Nishio* and *Elwell*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claims 20 and 21 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and, therefore, are also believed to be patentable over *Nishio* and *Elwell* for the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has filed to reveal anything which, in Applicant’s opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons.

Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 4892724_1.DOC